

The minutes reflect the impressions of the writer, of the discussions and proposals and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the specifications to determine MDT requirements.

May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2006  
MCA-MDT Technical Committee Meeting

Bob Warren filled in for Glen Frost and opened the meeting with introductions.

**MDT NEW BUSINESS**

**1. Summary of Specification Revisions.** MDT distributed a summary of active specs with several proposed revisions that will be distributed the first part of June. MDT stated that some of the treated wood specs will not be incorporated without industry discussions and input. Many of the wood treating companies are not represented by MCA and will be contacted directly prior to any decisions in regard to these specification revisions. A copy of the proposed changes to 104.06, 203.01.1, and 203.04.1 was distributed. These address double payment issues for materials as well as defining special borrow excavation more clearly. Please submit comments on any proposed spec changes to [mdtspecifications@mt.gov](mailto:mdtspecifications@mt.gov)

**2. Workshops.** MDT announced two seminars that will be held in the MDT auditorium that may be of interest to some MCA members.

- High Performance Concrete – June 20, 2006.
- Accelerated Bridge Construction – June 21, 2006.

Registration is required, contact Kris Christensen at 444- 7286.

**AGENDA ITEMS**

**1. Horizontal Line Control.** MDT is attempting to lower costs by limiting traffic control set-ups (example setting string line out in front of the paver). When a surveyor is on the project for horizontal line control prior to the paving operation, MDT would expect that they have the proper traffic control and will pay for this.

**2. 202.03.1 Bridge Removal.** MDT will allow concrete to be broken to 12 inch minus in the maximum dimension with no rebar for placement in the embankment, the bituminous material will remain 6 inches in the maximum dimension.

**3. Traffic Control.** MCA indicated that they had comments on the rate schedule and MDT's justification spreadsheet. MDT has not received those comments and MCA will follow-up and send them. The issue of Lump Sum traffic control was discussed and MCA believes there are two standards used by MDT field personnel, one for lump sum and another for units. MDT stated that there will be considerable changes in traffic control and traffic control plans as we work through the new Work Zone Safety and Mobility rule. This is an update to the FHWA work zone regulations under 23 CFR 630 subpart J. MDT will be filling a new position dedicated to traffic control and part of this persons duties will be to address these type of concerns and uniformity.

The minutes reflect the impressions of the writer, of the discussions and proposals and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the specifications to determine MDT requirements.

**4. Subcontractor Requirements.** MCA feels that the guidance on subcontractors did not answer all of their questions and thought there were still some gray areas. MDT asked that specific examples or situations be submitted for clarification. MDT also pointed out that Vicky Koch attends the 9:30 meeting and would be happy to come earlier next month for the Technical meeting if MCA has specific questions for her.

**5. Concrete Acceptance.** MDT advised that QA/QC for concrete is currently being looked at MDT is continuing to work on this subject. MCA will be involved in any implementation of the consultants' recommendations, some of which may be implemented quickly while others will take some time. MCA asked about the possibility of using referee samples and tests. MDT advised that after the FHWA seminar that focused on statistical analysis and acceptance that it is less likely. FHWA discourages their use based on how statistical acceptance works. MCA asked if MDT would consider allowing the Contractors to perform all testing and acceptance through a third party. MDT could look at a proposal for this but stated that there are very stringent federal guidelines for doing so and would need to oversee and verify any such process. MDT will send MCA the FHWA technical guideline.

**6. 107.08 Load Restrictions.** MDT has adopted the current revision and will consider other operations when and if received. MDT requested that MCA submit proposals with specific truck axle and weight configurations but has not received anything as of yet. Submit requests to [mdtspecifications@mt.gov](mailto:mdtspecifications@mt.gov) and we will coordinate with the Materials Bureau's Pavement Analysis section.

**7. CBC, CTS Tables 701-8 and 701-10.** MDT is still working on this, but the proposed test project fell through.

**8. Ride Spec and Plant Mix Forum.** MCA is concerned with several overlay projects that did not have isolation lifts and had the ride spec. MCA did not think it was appropriate to have the ride included without the ability to improve the ride. This will be less of a problem in the future as several of these were projects that were let during the transition to the use of isolation lifts. MDT stated that the Q&A forum would be the place to address this issue.

**9. Sulfate Soundness.** Progress is being made, but the preliminary results do not appear to be as cut-and-dry as was hoped. The data needs to be examined.

**10. Pulverization.** MDT anticipates having a draft specification for the June meeting.

**11. Contract Time and Chipping.** MCA indicated the date change to after July 4<sup>th</sup> has worked very well but there is still a problem with the short duration projects. Contractors often need to decide if they can bid a project based on the contract time and their chipping

The minutes reflect the impressions of the writer, of the discussions and proposals and are not intended to imply or announce policy or directives. Refer to the specifications to determine MDT requirements.

capabilities. MDT will look at the time calculations and rewording the specifications to be more flexible on the chipping dates when that is the only item of work that is left.

**12. 2007 Engineering Conference.** MDT would like more input on possible topics that Contractors would be interested in attending. The 2007 conference will be at the Missoula Hilton Garden Inn, February 6<sup>th</sup> through the 8<sup>th</sup>.

## **NEW BUSINESS FROM MCA**

**1. Method Specifications.** MCA believes MDT is still using method specs. MDT advised that the general philosophy is to move towards performance specs when possible, but method specs will continue to be used when there is not an adequate method to measure the performance of the end product.

**2. Environmental Issues.** MCA stated they often get “dinged” by agencies such as DEQ when they have followed the guidelines. It was pointed out that MDT and the Contractors are co-permittees and both have an obligation to meet the requirements of the permits and regulations. Often this requires education of the agencies that do not understand the project. District environmental specialists are a good resource for reviewing and preventing possible problems. DEQ considers the “potential” for silt to leave the project as a violation. These are responded to routinely, it is not until it actually occurs that there is enforcement action and very seldom do these occur on our projects.

**3. Utilities.** This continues to be a very serious problem and several examples were discussed. MDT and MCA are working together to seek solutions and need to move to the next level after the initial meeting where problems and possible solutions were discussed. The next step is to meet with the utility companies to find solutions, if that is not successful, legislative action will be required.

**4. Asphalt Availability.** Asphalt suppliers will not give quotes that are binding for 2007 delivery. Construction cost increases in general were discussed. MDT indicated that the fuel price escalation spec may be of some help in this area. Time ran out and this item will be continued at the next meeting.